

sf
6.9.9.2



Nick Zilka
<nzilka@nidlink.com>

03/29/2001 07:40 AM

To: Marykay Voytilla/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

cc: Hanson <rhanson@deq.state.id.us>, Ralston <ralston@moscow.com>, Lee <leej@tgenviro.com>

Subject: Re: Thoughts About Spring Monitoring Program

Mary Kay, My initial thoughts are that TerraGraphics could do whatever surface monitoring is possible at the times they collect piezo data. This could be scheduled I suppose or done at times other than when Jim and Bill do surveys. Just need to figure out best approach. I would like Dale to continue with data evaluation. I would also like to discuss with the group the value of doing a scaled back version of the underground monitoring.

Voytilla.Marykay@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> Hi all,
> A few days ago I forwarded to you a March 14, 2001 memo prepared by
> CH2M Hill regarding 2001 Bunker Hill mine water monitoring. I mentioned
> that I would set up a conference call for us to discuss the memo, but that
> I would first review the RI/FS project budget to identify the extent of
> funding for implementing an in-mine monitoring program this Spring. Folks,
> I'm sorry if I got your expectations up too high, and perhaps I should have
> looked at the budget before I sent out the memo, but I don't have the
> excess funds to undertake an in-mine water sampling program under the
> current RI/FS budget.
>
> Jim and I went through the RI/FS budget and remaining tasks today.
> Our outstanding work under the RI/FS work assignment includes: finalizing
> and printing the RI/FS report; draft and final biological assessment;
> draft and final CTP compliance document (the "NPDES permit equivalent"
> document that Hill is preparing to identify how we will meet the TMDLs, the
> expected effluent quality and characteristics, and the associated water
> quality monitoring activities that will be undertaken); assistance in
> preparation of a proposed plan and record of decision; attendance at public
> meetings and preparation of presentation materials for such meetings; and
> preparation of a responsiveness summary. After funding these activities at
> the level of effort that we currently estimate will be needed, were
> projecting a possible excess of funds of about \$30 - \$40,000. I'm not
> comfortable committing \$34,000 to the monitoring program now and possibly
> being short of funds later. Especially, given the extreme tightness of
> funds at EPA for this type of work (i.e., our region alone is short
> \$800,000 for RI/FS work for this fiscal year, has had to cut certain
> projects and postpone others, and is indicating that next year will be no
> different).
>
> On the positive side, I am willing to go ahead and okay the surface
> stream monitoring efforts as outlined in table 1 of Hill's March memo, and
> okay the continued reporting, interpretation and manipulation of piezometer
> data (also identified in table 1). Hill's estimate for this work is about
> \$12,000. Do you all want to discuss this further on a conference call, or
> should we just go ahead with planning for the surface stream monitoring?
> Nick, would DEQ, TerraGraphics, or Dale be participating in the surface
> stream monitoring effort?
>
> Mary Kay

